



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

vitality of our country", says Mathorez; and, further, "If the kingdom had not continually received foreigners who became merged into the population, one would readily have perceived a considerable diminution in the subjects of the king" (p. 3). There is no more arresting sentence in the entire volume; nor any portion of his work more thought-provoking than that in which the author discusses depopulation under the Old Régime. A people who increased but a million and a half, less than six per cent., in four hundred and fifty years (1328-1778), only 3300 a year! was plainly in need of constant recruitment from without (pp. 16-21). The earlier centuries were seemingly unaware of the drift, or accepted a high mortality with a fatalistic shrug. The eighteenth century had fewer illusions about the "ways of Providence"; philosophers, economists, officials, and churchmen sensed the danger, sounded a warning, and sought for a remedy. A hundred and fifty years before Bertillon, Levasseur, and Leroy-Beaulieu, this spectre of a declining birth-rate was agitating Condorcet, Montesquieu, Mirabeau, and Buffon. No doubt there were optimists then as now, who argued from the continuity of history "France has always been; she will continue to be"; or who counted upon the miraculous gift of assimilation, the "power of France to make French whatever comes to her". *Eh bien*; the problem still remains, and to-day the danger is more acute than ever! It were well for the optimists of the present to ponder the warning of Leroy-Beaulieu: "Dépopulation prochaine ou dénationalisation prochaine de la France, s'il ne se produit un revirement prompt et décisif de la mentalité française, voilà la dilemme; voilà la destinée qu'on peut regarder comme inéluctable" (*La Question de la Population*, 1913, p. 365).

THEODORE COLLIER.

The English Catholics in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth: a Study of their Politics, Civil Life, and Government, 1558-1580, from the Fall of the Old Church to the Advent of the Counter-Reformation. By JOHN HUNGERFORD POLLEN, S.J. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1920. Pp. xi, 387. \$7.50.)

THIS is apparently a scholar's book, and, if we regard the preface as the serious opinion of the author, to his thinking one much needed in a dry and thirsty land where little cultivation had been attempted. Father Pollen informs us that he is attempting to lay down principles, to provide fundamental points of judgment for students and readers, and it is therefore essential to view his volume from a somewhat different point of view than that of a narrative history. The soundness of his assumptions, the critical value of his judgments, are certainly for us to consider. From this point of view, his title and his first sentence will surprise many students. He begins his story with "the fall of the Old

Church in 1558". Obviously the Catholic Church did not fall under Henry VIII.! Does he infer that the Reformation did not begin under Henry? Does he presume that no events of real importance took place before 1558? Does he propose to treat the reign of Elizabeth as the real breach with Rome, and the acts of Henry as an internal reformation within the Church itself? If so, he is laying down a principle in Catholic history which will be new to many and the significance of which will reach far. It is perhaps as well to call attention to the fact that this book bears the official imprimatur of the Catholic Church in England. If this is to be the position of "the English Catholic Church" in regard to the history of the Reformation, it is an exceedingly important position. The first sentence confirms this: "When Elizabeth came to the throne, she found herself face to face with the venerable Church which St. Augustine had founded close on a thousand years before, which had grown with the people and had become an integral part of the national life". Needless to add, there is not a word in that sentence which has not been actively controverted, not merely by Protestants, but by Catholics.

Father Pollen continues his story to the year 1580—"to the advent of the Counter-Reformation". He proposes therefore to regard the militant movement of Allen and the Jesuits as a literal counter-reformation of the Church in England. He tells us that this period marks "the return to life of the Old Church". He infers therefore that what was attempted in 1580 was what actually succeeded. He really proposes to date the continuous history of the Catholic Church now in England from the militant movement inaugurated by Parsons; certainly from the secular movement inaugurated by Allen. His own studies have made clear to us that he realizes, as others have, that in 1580 there was, in the old sense of the word, no Catholic organization in England at all. There were no bishops; no recognition of papal authority in any formal way; and there was instituted at that time merely the missionary organization of the Jesuits and the few seculars. If this be the "return" of the "Old Church", the importance of the acceptance of such "principles" and "conclusions" will be obvious to the least experienced.

If that be his notion of the Old Church, many will question it. And why, again, should he write of the *return* of what obviously does not *continue*? If in Father Pollen's opinion the continuity of life of the Catholic Church of the Middle Ages was not interfered with by the acts of Henry VIII. and by the reform legislation of Edward VI., it is difficult to see the basis of his contention that the real destruction of the Church was accomplished by Elizabeth. That a very real continuity of life among English Catholics persisted from before the reign of Henry to the present day, there are few who will be prepared to deny. The men who believed in the Pope in England in the reign of Elizabeth were numerous, and an actual continuity of Catholic life was a fact.

Father Pollen attempts to show that throughout this period the Church disappeared for about twenty years. Surely there is some difficulty here in his principles, some further need of definition. The majority who have studied the organization of the English Church under Elizabeth have concluded with no great difficulty that the final organization accepted by English Catholics does not date from Elizabeth's reign at all. The historical movement which led actually to the establishment of bishops is more likely subsequent to 1610 than preceding it, and under any circumstances is not, by the majority of secular Catholics, dated earlier than the Wisbech Stirs of the last decade of Elizabeth's reign—a good fifteen years subsequent to the success of the "Counter-Reformation", if that is what Father Pollen means by the word "advent". Certainly, if the life of the Old Church began again in 1580, the secular movement for the institution of bishops becomes a detail of relative unimportance; the true work was already performed. The majority of students have not accepted such conclusions. Protestants and Catholic alike have seen the institution of bishops not established until 1623, and decline to accept the institution of a formal organization of Catholic laymen until the normal Catholic episcopal organization had come into existence.

The real question raised by Father Pollen seems to be: "What is or was Catholic organization and parties in England during the reign of Elizabeth?" If we take the broad sweep of the story and count as Catholics all those who thought of themselves at that time as Catholics, we shall have a very different story to trace than that thus sketched for us by Father Pollen. His title again states, and his preface confirms it, that his book is a study of the "politics, civil life, and government of the Catholics in England". One would expect to find an internal history of Catholic parties with the relationship of Catholic individuals to each other and a reasonably lengthy examination of the extent to which the older episcopal organization, or parish organization, was continued secretly through this period. There is, no doubt, in the book much information which bears on these points, but it cannot be honestly said that Father Pollen has addressed himself consciously to the solution of these issues. He has provided a readable account of the history of these twenty years, dealing with the rising of the North, the Bull of Excommunication, conflicts with foreign Catholics, and the like, from the point of view of the general premises just mentioned. An internal history of Catholic organization such as Father Pollen might write would be exceptionably valuable, but this book does not contain it. One is also led to question somewhat the ultimate designation of the book when one finds Father Pollen feeling it necessary to remind scholars to beware of the summary printed in the *Calendars of State Papers* and to read the manuscripts themselves. The criticism of the editing of the *Calendars* is again gratuitous, if true. The importance of such a volume as

this, announcing such premises and conclusions, from the pen of as well known an author as Father Pollen, is impossible to overstate, but Catholics as well as Protestants will do well to examine what his true contentions are.

ROLAND G. USHER.

Henry Fox, First Lord Holland, his Family and Relations. By the Earl of ILCHESTER. In two volumes. (London: John Murray; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1920. Pp. xv, 365; xi, 391. 32 sh.)

It is not great statesmen always who make political history or shape political standards; and the importance of Henry Fox is well known to anyone familiar with eighteenth-century England. Thus a well-rounded life of the man who with Sir Robert Walpole shares the distinction of having shown the greatest talent in parliamentary management in the days of the unreformed House of Commons fills a patent void in our historical records. The reviewer's own work¹ may perhaps have adequately portrayed his importance, and little fresh light is shed on the Newcastle ministry of which Fox was a main pillar, but the former work was necessarily meagre in its account of the less prominent periods of his career, for a study of which Lord Ilchester has drawn profitably from the Holland House and other manuscripts, inaccessible to the American scholar. The present work is the sixth that has appeared from that marvellous storehouse.

Unlike the reviewer's book, Lord Ilchester's volumes are strictly a biography. One might feel at times that Fox's associates are little more than shadows in the background of the hero's portrait; but the character and activities of the statesman himself are interestingly unfolded on almost every page. The subject is also presented with studied impartiality; and one may even question the statement that "the world regarding Fox as Orford's disciple was prone to view his methods with suspicion". No one, not even Pitt, attacked the corrupt machine-methods of the time, and Ilchester has elsewhere placed the unpopularity of Fox on more solid grounds—his association with the hated Duke of Cumberland, his abandonment of a promising career in order to fill a lucrative position of secondary importance, and, later, his identification with the ministry of Bute. Lord Ilchester, like every good Britisher, is an admirer of Pitt, and deals gently with that staunch patriot's political sins and shortcomings; but Fox himself is, after all, the best *exposeur* of his rival's limitations; and his comparison of Chat-ham with Sunderland (vol. II., p. 311) is one of the many interesting gleanings from the Holland House manuscripts.

¹ [*Henry Fox, First Lord Holland: a Study of the Career of an Eighteenth-Century Politician*, by Thad W. Riker (two volumes, Oxford, 1911); see *Amer. Hist. Rev.*, XVII. 823-824. Ed.]